



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,933	03/06/2002	John C. Karamanos	0003-029	7363
40972	7590	03/28/2006		
HENNEMAN & SAUNDERS 714 WEST MICHIGAN AVENUE THREE RIVERS, MI 49093			EXAMINER TANNER, HARRY B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/092,933	Applicant(s) KARAMANOS ET AL.	
	Examiner Harry B. Tanner	Art Unit 3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,12-19,22,26-28 and 30-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,12-19,22,26-28 and 30-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3744

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9, 12-19, 22, 26-27 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haessig in view of admitted prior art. Haessig discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Haessig discloses a ventilation flow control unit having a flow controller 69, 63,63A mounted on a plenum, a flow sensor 80 and a thermal coil 55 fixed in the plenum. It is taken to be admitted prior art that electrical disconnects such as plug and sockets, switches or wire terminals, voltage transformers for reducing supply voltage, automatic control valves on cooling coils to control cooling, and mounting brackets to support control valves are conventional in the air conditioning art in view of applicant's lack of any contention that such devices are not conventional. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Haessig such that it included the use of same.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 28, 30-42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haessig in view of admitted prior art as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Noboru. Noboru teaches the use of an isolation valve 7 on the inlet of a ventilation system as well as control valves on the exhaust and return lines. It would

Art Unit: 3744

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Haessig such that it included the use of an isolation valve on the inlet of the ventilation system as well as control valves on the exhaust and return lines in view of the teachings of Noboru.

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example, with respect to applicant's contention that the cited prior art does not show a protection bracket to protect the automatic valve from damage during transportation and installation, it is noted that claim 7 is an apparatus claim directed to a ventilation flow control unit. How the parts of the unit are transported and installed are not patentable limitations on an apparatus claim. The examiner has stated that mounting brackets to support control valves are conventional and applicant has not contended that such mounting brackets are not well known in the art. Applicant contends that there is no suggestion or motivation for providing the system of Haessig with the various components stated as being conventional. It is the examiner's position that the cooling coil 55 will inherently requires some sort of control valve to control the flow of cooling fluid in order to regulate the amount of cooling based upon cooling demand as is well known in the art. Likewise, a sensor such as flow sensor 80 will need some sort of electrical connector to connect the wires leading to controller 69. Plugs and wire terminals are well known means for connecting a sensor to a control device. Such connectors are inherently "electrical disconnects" since unplugging or loosening the wire terminal electrically disconnects the sensor.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry B. Tanner whose telephone number is (571) 272-4813. The examiner can normally be reached 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler, can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>.

Art Unit: 3744

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Harry B. Tanner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Harry" and last name "Tanner" clearly distinguishable.

Harry B. Tanner
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3744